

### Remarks

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 6-11, and 14-17 have been rejected by the Examiner. In response, claims 1 and 9 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. Claims 18-23 have been added. Thus, claims 1-3, 6-11, and 14-23 remain pending in the application.

### Amendment to the Specification

The Specification has been amended to include paragraphs from provisional application number 60/418,924 ('924), taken from pages 5-8 of '924. The instant application claims priority to '924 and fully incorporates it by reference (see page 2 of the instant application). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the added paragraphs do not constitute new matter.

### Amendments and New Claims

Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 9 may be found at least on page 11, line 18 through page 12, line 3 of the instant application. Support for new claims 18 and 21 may be found at least in now cancelled portions of claims 1 and 9. Support for new claims 20 and 23 may be found at least on page 11, lines 18-21 of the instant application. Support for new claims 19 and 22 may be found at least in the paragraphs of '924 shown above in "Amendments to the Specification". Additional, implicit support for new claims 19 and 22 may be found at least on page 11, line 16 through page 12, line 14 of the instant application.

### The Examiner's "Response to Arguments"

In "Response to Arguments", item 2 on page 2, the Examiner notes additional teachings of Yach (citation below) which the Examiner asserts to teach/suggest previously contended elements of claim 1. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9 to overcome the Examiner's rejections, reciting subject matter that is not taught or suggested by Cermak (citation below) and Yach.

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” item 4 on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1, 3, 6-8 have been rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,763,095 to *Cermak et al.* (hereinafter “Cermak”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0128036 to *Yach et al.* (hereinafter “Yach”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

More specifically, the Examiner cites Figures 2B, 15A and 15B, and paragraphs 117 and 121 of Yach as teaching a list of communication protocols that a user may select from to respond to a message. Figure 2B illustrates an exemplary display showing an email message alongside an interface showing a plurality of protocols in which a user may reply (e.g., “email person Y”, “SMS person Y”, “call person Y”, etc.). Figure 15B also shows a list of communication messages, such as emails and calls, to and from a number of communication partners, which Yach describes as a “unified event listing”.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner combines the teachings of Yach with the teachings of primary reference Cermak. Cermak simply teaches a system for identifying callers/senders to a called/messaged party to facilitate the party in determining whether to answer/respond. In one variation, Cermak discloses displaying the messages, such as call messages, IM messages, voicemail messages, and email messages, in a unified messaging mailbox on a television or a workstation.

In response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to overcome the Examiner’s rejection. Amended claim 1 now recites, in part, “receiving, by the wireless mobile communication device, a second user request from the same or another input key of the wireless mobile communication device particularizing the list of communication messages to include only messages to and from a single communication partner, the particularized list being a thread of communication with the communication partner.”

In contrast, Cermak and Yach simply do not teach or suggest any sort of mechanism for allowing a user to particularize a list of communication messages to include only messages to and from a single communication partner. While they do collectively teach a unified message list of communication messages to and from one or more partners of two or more message types (see Yach Figure 15B), they provide no way for the user to refine/particularize the list to include only messages to and from a

single communication partner, resulting in a unified communication thread with that partner. While it is possible that messages may only be sent to and received from a single communication partner in Cermak and Yach, resulting in a list having only messages to and from a single partner, this nonetheless does not suggest a method for allowing a user to particularize a list of messages to and from one or more communication partners to include only messages from a single communication partner. In fact, Cermak and Yach arguably teach away from such a mechanism of particularizing, as they are concerned with providing a mechanism for allowing a user to view all events associated with the mobile device (see paragraph x of Yach). In contrast, amended claim 1 is directed to a method of allowing a user to visualize a thread of communication between the user and a single communication partner. Because such a thread is not likely to include all events associated with a mobile device, one of ordinary skill would not modify Cermak and Yach to include such particularizing.

Additionally, in the previous rejection of claim 9, the Examiner cited Smith (citation below) as disclosing a list of messages to and from a single communication partner. First, Applicants note that the passages of column 8 of Smith cited by the Examiner do not actually teach this, but rather merely teach sorting a list of messages by sender, as is known in the art. Second, even assuming *arguendo* that such a list is suggested by Smith, it does not follow that a mechanism for creating that list by particularizing another list is taught or suggested. Smith is simply concerned with providing a unified messaging interface and does not discuss any sort of need or utility for customizing a list of messages to represent a thread of messages with a single communication partner.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 is patentable over Cermak and Yach, alone or in combination, under 35 USC §103(a).

Claims 3 and 6-8 depend from claim 1, incorporating its limitations. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 3 and 6-8 are patentable over Cermak and Yach, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

Additionally, for at least the above reasons that Cermak and Yach fail to suggest the particularizing recited by amended claim 1, they also fail to suggest that “the

wireless mobile communication device has multiple threads with multiple communication partners”, as recited by new claims 19 and 22 and that “the particularizing is based at least in part on an identifier associated with the communication partner”, as recited by new claims 20 and 23.

2. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” item 5 on page 6 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 9, 11, and 14-17 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Cermak in view of in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,333,973 to *Smith et al.* (hereinafter “Smith”), and further in view of Yach under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Amended claim 9 recites limitations similar to those of amended claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claim 9 is patentable over Cermak and Yach, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

Smith does not cure the deficiencies of Cermak and Yach. Accordingly, amended claim 9 is patentable over Cermak, Yach, and Smith, alone or in combination, under 35 USC §103(a).

Claims 11 and 14-17 depend from claim 9, incorporating its limitations. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 11 and 14-17 are patentable over Cermak, Yach, and Smith, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

3. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” item 6 on page 10 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 2 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Cermak in view of Yach, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0177471 to *Kaaresoja et al.* (hereinafter “Kaaresoja”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Kaaresoja does not cure the deficiencies of Cermak and Yach. Accordingly, claim 1 remains patentable over Cermak, Yach, and Kaaresoja, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, incorporating its limitations. Accordingly, claim 2 is patentable over Cermak, Yach, and Kaaresoja, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

4. In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" item 7 on page 10 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 10 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Cermak in view of Smith in view of Yach, and further in view of Kaaresoja under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Kaaresoja does not cure the deficiencies of Cermak, Smith, and Yach. Accordingly, claim 9 remains patentable over Cermak, Smith, Yach, and Kaaresoja, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above.

Claim 10 depends from claim 9, incorporating its limitations. Accordingly, claim 10 is patentable over Cermak, Smith, Yach, and Kaaresoja, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-2, 6-11, and 14-23 are solicited. As a result of the amendments made herein, Applicants submit that claims 1-2, 6-11, and 14-23 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (206) 407-1513. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,  
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: January 18, 2008

by: /Robert C. Peck/  
Robert C. Peck  
Reg. No.: 56,826

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.  
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900  
1211 SW Fifth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97222  
Telephone: 503-222-9981